

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a second sheet that is solid. Certainly, the fact that it is called a sheet necessarily means that it is solid. But in order to preclude the application of the reference as proposed by the Examiner and to do so explicitly, it is required that the second sheet be a solid.

The rejection suggests that the second sheet could be the liquid 5 or 6. 5 is a developer. See paragraph 72. For at least this reason, reconsideration is requested.

Moreover, the claim requires temporarily flattening a sheet. To read the claim on the reference, the Examiner requires that the developer holder, which is described as "plate like," (see paragraph 71) is flattened by being pressed from above, with a liquid in between. It is respectfully submitted that the presence of a liquid in between the two makes flattening impossible.

Moreover, the fact that the item 1 is the developer holder, which is describes as plate like" and is pre-made for the purpose, makes it extremely unlikely that it would be flattened by any operation. In other words, to be flattened, it must be warped to begin with. There is no reason to believed that it is warped to begin with and there is no reason to believe that the liquid over the top of it, even when pressed from above, could apply any flattening force to the structure.

Therefore, there is no basis for the rejection and it should be withdrawn.

Claim 15 calls for receiving a warped sheet. To make out the rejection, it must be contended that the developer holder, which is plate like, is presumed to be warped, when there is no reason why someone would be dumb enough to use a warped developer holder. Further, the claim calls for flattening that sheet, which is incredible since there is no reason to believe that the sheet was unflattened in the first place or to believe that applying pressure from above through a liquid could affect flattening.

Further, the claim calls for applying electrodes to the sheet and, even if another reference teaches applying electrodes to a sheet, it is incredible that the electrodes could be applied to a liquid. Thus, the combination of the two cited references is not viable.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 12 is requested.


Claim 16 calls for temporarily flattening a ceramic sheet. It is not believable that the application of a force from above through a liquid would flatten the ceramic sheet in the reference. Moreover, the reference never suggests that the develop holder is ceramic in the first place.

Moreover, the claim calls for processing a glass panel to define row and column electrodes thereon. Nothing of the sort is done in any of the cited references.

Then, it is required that the sheet be secured to the glass while holding the center of the sheet in the flattened configuration. Again, this clearly does not happen in the cited reference to Nakamura since there is no ceramic, there is no glass panel, and there are no electrodes that could be applied to the liquid described in the reference. Again, the rejection is not sustainable and should be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation